

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

TODD R.G. HILL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.

THE BOARD AND DIRECTORS,  
OFFICERS, AND AGENTS AND  
INDIVIDUALS OF PEOPLES  
COLLEGE OF LAW, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-BFM

**ORDER DENYING  
RECONSIDERATION**

**INTRODUCTION**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Todd R.G. Hill's Motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order accepting the Magistrate Judge's Interim Report and Recommendation. (ECF 253.) That Order dismissed many of the claims in Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint without leave to amend and dismissed Defendants associated with the State Bar of California with prejudice. (*See* ECF 248.)

For the reasons stated below, the Court **DENIES** the Motion for reconsideration.

## BACKGROUND

On February 12, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued an Interim Report and Recommendation, recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint. (*See* ECF 213.) The Report recommended dismissal of all of Plaintiff's federal claims without leave to amend, with the narrow exception of his civil RICO claim. (ECF 213 at 29-30.) It also recommended dismissing all Defendants associated with the State Bar of California with prejudice. (ECF 213 at 32.)

Plaintiff filed Objections to the Interim Report and Recommendation (ECF 217) and several motions for judicial notice of various documents. (See ECF 222, 224, 227, 228, 232, 243.) He also filed a Motion for reconsideration reiterating points he raised in previous motions. (ECF 237.)

The Court accepted the Magistrate Judge's Interim Report and Recommendation on March 27, 2025. (ECF 248). Plaintiff again sought reconsideration on March 28, 2025. (ECF 253.) In his most recent Motion, Plaintiff argues that the Court committed clear error in accepting the Interim Report and Recommendation and failed to consider certain arguments and "newly" discovered evidence. Plaintiff later filed a supplement with additional "newly discovered" evidence. (ECF 259.)

## DISCUSSION

## I. Legal Standard

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). Reconsideration of a court's order is an "extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). Motions for reconsideration should not be granted

1 “unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence,  
2 committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling  
3 law.” *389 Orange St Partners v. Arnold*, 179 F.3d 656 (9th Cir. 1999). Motions  
4 for reconsideration may not “be used to raise arguments or present evidence for  
5 the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the  
6 litigation.” *Kona Enters.*, 229 F.3d at 890.

7 Motions for reconsideration are also governed by Local Rule 7-18, which  
8 provides:

9 A motion for reconsideration of an Order on any motion or  
10 application may be made only on the grounds of (a) a material  
11 difference in fact or law from that presented to the Court that, in  
12 the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been known to  
13 the party moving for reconsideration at the time the Order was  
14 entered, or (b) the emergence of new material facts or a change of  
15 law occurring after the Order was entered, or (c) a manifest  
16 showing of a failure to consider material facts presented to the  
17 Court before the Order was entered. No motion for reconsideration  
18 may in any manner repeat any oral or written argument made in  
19 support of, or in opposition to, the original motion.

20 L.R. 7-18.

21 **II. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration**

22 Plaintiff fails to establish any basis for reconsideration. He does not  
23 identify any material difference in fact or law that could not have been known  
24 with reasonable diligence at the time of the Court's decision, nor does he  
25 establish a failure to consider material facts. *See* L.R. 7-18. Moreover, all of  
26 Plaintiff's arguments were either raised before or could have been raised in  
27 previous pleadings. With respect to the latter category of arguments, the Motion  
28

1 does not explain why those arguments could not have been raised earlier.

The only new evidence that could not have been presented sooner is the April 2025 memorandum issued by the State Bar of California, which summarizes the oversight and administrative functions of the Board of Trustees and the Committee of Bar Examiners. (ECF 259 at 16-21.) The Magistrate Judge concluded that Plaintiff's claims against the State Bar failed, principally, because he had not plausibly alleged that that entity or its employees acted with intent to discriminate. (*See, e.g.*, ECF 213 at 14-16 (dismissing Plaintiff's equal protection claim for failing to plausibly allege the State Bar acted with intent to discriminate).) And nothing in the State Bar memorandum suggests a different conclusion. As such, though this evidence was not previously before the Court, it does not warrant revisiting the prior decision to adopt the Report and Recommendation.

## CONCLUSION

16 For the foregoing reasons, the court **DENIES** the Motion for  
17 Reconsideration (ECF 253).

19 DATED: April 25, 2025

HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE